



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY INSTALLATION MANAGEMENT COMMAND
HEADQUARTERS, UNITED STATES ARMY GARRISON, FT BRAGG
2175 REILLY ROAD, STOP A
FORT BRAGG NORTH CAROLINA 28310-5000

IMBG-PL

3 May 2012

MEMORANDUM FOR Garrison Commander

SUBJECT: Out-of-Home Abuse After Actions Review

1. Purpose. To provide the results of the After Action Review (AAR) of the installation's response to alleged out-of-home child abuse involving a substitute teacher.

2. Background.

a. It is Department of the Army policy to provide a safe and secure environment for all Army personnel and their Families, prevent out-of-home child abuse, and promote early identification and intervention in allegations of out-of-home child abuse in DOD-operated or sanctioned activities. These activities include Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary Schools. Recently, the installation did not implement a timely, fully coordinated multidisciplinary team approach to abuse allegations concerning a substitute teacher at on post dependent schools.

b. To determine why this occurred, on 28 March 2012 the installation conducted a thorough AAR of its response. The AAR reviewed the sequence of events and the actions taken by the specific individuals and organizations involved. This memorandum highlights areas of concern and captures the lessons learned necessary to ensure Fort Bragg responds to any future allegations of out-of-home child abuse in a timely, coordinated manner. The AAR did not address the status of the on-going law enforcement investigation.

c. The AAR focused on three areas:

- (1) Fort Bragg Agency Notification/Coordination Processes.
- (2) Installation Chain of Command Notification Processes.
- (3) Community/Parent Awareness Notification Processes.

3. The following individuals participated in the AAR:

Mr. (b) (6)	Deputy to the Garrison Commander
LTC	Deputy Chief, Department of Social Work
LTC	Deputy Staff Judge Advocate (OSJA)
CPT	Special Assistant U.S. Attorney (USAO)
MAJ	Criminal Investigation Division (CID)

Agent (b) (6)	Criminal Investigation Division (CID)
LTC (b) (6)	Provost Marshal Office (PMO)
Chief (b) (6)	Provost Marshal Office (PMO)
Mr. (b) (6)	Directorate of Emergency Services
Mr.	Public Affairs Office
Mr.	Deputy Superintendent Fort Bragg Schools
Dr.	Principal, Pope Elementary School
Mr.	Army Community Service (ACS)
Mr.	Family Advocacy Program Manager (FAPM)
Mr.	Directorate of Plans, Training, Mobilization, and Security

4. AAR Summary.

a. The primary cause of the installation's failure to implement a timely, fully coordinated multidisciplinary team approach IAW AR 608-18 was a reporting breakdown that occurred on 8 November 2011 when law enforcement learned of the allegation:

(1) The Desk Sergeant at the Provost Marshal Office (PMO) failed to implement the established procedures and protocols when notified of the allegations. This failure prevented the required notification processes and installation response efforts outlined in AR 608-18, Army Family Advocacy Program and XVIII Airborne Corps and Fort Bragg Memorandum of Instruction (MOI) 1-10, Family Advocacy Program.

(2) The Desk Sergeant should have initiated a Serious Incident Report (SIR) and reporting requirements would have alerted the Womack Army Medical Center (WAMC) Department of Social Work (DSW), the FAPM, and the Garrison Commander. Once notified, these officials would have established an Installation Strategy Team to address corrective actions and parent notification procedures.

b. The abuse allegations did reach CID personnel through notification from the PMO after school hours on 8 November 2011. The following morning, CID notified the Pope Elementary School Principal. The Principal immediately removed the substitute teacher from any further duties at the school and the superintendent barred him from working at any other school in the district. Both CID and the Principal then passed notifications up their respective supervisory chains. Neither notified Family Advocacy or made plans to notify the larger parent community. Because the alleged offender was a civilian, CID also notified the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

c. There were also a number of missed opportunities to alert the installation leadership to the alleged abuse after the first allegation on 8 November 2011:

(1) A Case Review Committee (CRC) supervised by the WAMC Commander meets bi-monthly. It coordinates medical, legal, law enforcement, social work assessments, identification, commander intervention, and investigation and treatment functions from the initial report of spouse or child abuse to case closure. Members of the CRC include representatives from the PMO, CID, the OSJA, and the Chaplain's office. Neither CID nor PMO representatives discussed the alleged abuse at any CRC meetings after 8 November 2011.

(2) On 2 December 2011, a WAMC DSW representative attended a bi-monthly Cumberland County Child Advocacy Center (CAC) case staffing. The CAC conducted forensic interviews with two children on behalf of CID and these cases were presented at the 2 December CAC meeting. The DSW representative failed to bring those cases back for DSW assignment thus senior leadership was never made aware of the allegations. At the time of the meeting, there was no written requirement (established protocol or procedure) to bring unknown cases back for case assignment or to report the information back to DSW leadership.

(3) On 21 December 2011 the Garrison Commander and Commander of the 16th MP Brigade received from CID an emailed copy of a Report of Investigation (ROI) pertaining to the alleged incident. The email's subject line only reflected the ROI number. As the email lacked any indicia of urgency, neither individual opened it to read the contents.

(4) On 6 January 2012, a different DSW representative attended the bi-monthly CAC case staffing meeting. An additional allegation and interview was presented at this time which was previously unknown to DSW. The DSW worker signed for a copy of the videotaped interview but, having just returned from major surgery, did not view it due to her backlog of other cases.

d. Ultimately, on 23 February 2012, DSW and the Army Community Service (ACS) FAP learned of the abuse from the company commander of one of the victim's parents. The parent had become frustrated with the lack of action and communication in his child's case and informed the company commander. The same day, CID notified DSW of a new allegation as well as several other previous allegations. At that point, installation organizations implemented the necessary actions and activated an Installation Strategy Team to coordinate the installation response.

5. Issues. The issues listed below are identified areas of required improvement. The first addresses the major factor contributing to the installation's failure to react in a coordinated manner to the initial allegation. Subsequent issues address improvements to memoranda of instruction, standing operating procedures, protocols, and procedures to enable the installation to respond more effectively. This includes

notifying parents as soon as possible regarding an alleged abuse incident. The suspense to begin implementing corrective actions is no later than 30 April 2012. In several instances, the corrective actions are already complete

a. Issue. Failure to implement established protocols and procedures upon notification of an alleged abuse incident.

(1) Discussion. As discussed in the summary, the critical point of failure in the installation's timely, fully coordinated multidisciplinary team approach was the PMO Desk Sergeant's failure to implement established PMO procedures and protocols when notified on 8 November 2011.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The Provost Marshal conducted a comprehensive "bottom up review" of protocols and procedures consisting of the following:

(a) The Provost Marshal addressed the failure of the Desk Sergeant to initiate proper notification procedures through appropriate corrective actions, to include retraining for the Sergeant involved.

(b) A review of current notification matrices resulted in multiple updates and the adding of additional criteria to the matrices for institutional abuse of children.

(c) A review and update of the SIR Distribution List(s), Blotter Distribution Lists, and Notification Distribution Lists.

(d) A review of the method by which the PMO updates and tracks both the distribution lists and the notification updates.

(e) A review of the actual response and reporting of this incident. This included interviews of multiple subordinates and the challenging of their responses.

(f) A review of the updating of incident narratives for standard responses and added a tracking form to all subject-related Military Police Reports.

(g) As a result of the review process, PMO leadership designed better forcing functions and triggers for the first responders to notify PMO partner services such as DSW, CID, and Victim Advocates.

(h) The PMO and WAMC DSW initiated training for Desk, MPI, and PMO operations staff with the Deputy Chief, DSW. The ACS Family Advocacy Program (FAP) Trainer was also present. The training detailed DSW functions and responsibilities, when PMO representatives

contact DSW, why PMO representatives contact DSW, how PMO representatives notify DSW, and what DSW's specific mission does to help law enforcement responders. The first iteration of this training occurred in January and will become a recurring requirement. The intent is to reach all investigators, desk crews, and PMO leaders.

b. Issue. Participation in CRC meetings.

(1) Discussion.

(a) The CRC provides the installation an opportunity to coordinate efforts in response to reports of spouse or child abuse. Furthermore, it requires a quorum of CRC members on official orders be present to vote on cases. Case Review Committee meetings typically vote on specific case determinations. However, the abuse allegations reported on 8 November 2011 were well within the functions outlined in MOI 1-10 and appropriate for discussion at the bi-weekly meetings.

(b) The bi-weekly CRC meetings are an important miniature update meeting for all key responders to child abuse. These include DSW personnel, CID, MPs, Chaplains, OSJA, Pediatrics, the Army Substance Abuse Program, and FAPM. Important updates and issues related to child and partner abuse reporting, treatment, and trainings always surface during these meetings. Questions/discussion during the CRC regarding the status of the alleged abuse case could have afforded the leadership the opportunity to learn early on about the alleged abuse.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. All designated organizations identified in MOI 1-10 will ensure a sufficient number of organization personnel are on official orders as participants and ensure participation at all meetings to receive/provide important updates.

c. Issue. Strategy Team activation.

(1) Discussion. Army Regulation 608-18 requires the installation to establish a Strategy Team to guide the installation response to alleged incidents of out-of-home abuse. However, the regulation does not establish a timeline for this. The response plan developed by the team addresses several areas:

(a) Corrective action or measures to be taken within the facility to ensure the safety of children (to include reassignment of the suspected offender pending completion of the investigation);

(b) Identification of a lead investigative agency to coordinate interviewing, identifying the pool of potential victims, and assigning interviewing teams; and

(c) The overall installation plan for communication with the press and public, services to victims and their parents, services for staff, and staff rights.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The FAPM is revising MOI 1-10 to reflect a requirement to establish the Strategy Team and conduct the initial Strategy Team meeting within five days after the report of a qualifying incident.

d. Issue. Designation of a Family Liaison Officer.

(1) Discussion.

(a) Army Regulation 608-18 requires the Installation Strategy Team to designate an individual to serve as a Family Liaison Officer (FLO) to keep Families informed of how an investigation is proceeding and provide information on available resources. However, the person should not be closely involved in the case. Support to Families may include information and referral support lines to answer parents' concerns, referrals for professional screening, and parent support groups.

(b) Several actions were taken throughout by individuals and organizations to assist and inform Families but a FLO was never designated. The Deputy Chief, DSW, the FAPM, the Deputy Garrison Commander and others met directly with Families to assess their needs. Eventually the OSJA established a Victim Witness Liaison and a DSW Intake Worker was assigned to assess all allegations related to this offender.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The ACS FAP will use one of several Child Advocate personnel assigned to the organization to serve as a FLO. Child Advocate personnel are non-clinical and already have a role supporting Families involved with child abuse allegations by providing information/referral and customer service support to ensure any/all emerging needs are supported in concert with the FAP Intake Worker at DSW.

e. Issue. Community/parent notification process.

(1) Discussion.

(a) Army Regulation 608-18 requires parental notification regarding alleged incidents of out-of-home abuse. The lateness in notifying parents was the result of a lack of familiarity with procedures for installation management of out-of-home abuse allegations by those involved, rather than an effort to keep information from parents.

(b) The regulation states officials provide information to parents, but it does not mandate notification by letter. If done by letter, it does not state when that notification should occur.

(c) Once Strategy Team members understood the circumstances of the allegations, the Garrison Commander sent a letter to all parents with children in schools where the alleged offender had worked, not just letters to the affected families. The Garrison Commander conducted three Town Hall meetings as a follow-up to the letter.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The FAPM is revising MOI 1-10 to require parental notification within two weeks of the report of an incident.

f. Issue. Child Advocacy Center (CAC) and other non-traditional reporting requirements.

(1) Discussion. As discussed in the summary paragraph, WAMC DSW representatives attended bi-monthly Cumberland County CAC meetings on 2 December 2011 and 6 January 2012. A discussion of forensic interviews related to this alleged offender occurred at these meetings. Department of Social Work senior leaders were not aware of the substance of the meetings because there was no requirement (established protocol or procedure) to report the information back to the department leadership. Had there been protocols in place that required notifying DSW leadership and initiation of case assignment procedures for previously unknown allegations, DSW senior leaders could have alerted other organizations and the Garrison Commander to the allegations of abuse.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The Deputy Chief, DSW is revising SOPs to include procedures requiring submission of a summary of discussions for all CAC meetings and/or initiation of case assignment procedures for any previously unknown allegations within 24 hours.

g. Issue. FAPM first responder training.

(1) Discussion. The response to out-of-home abuse allegations demonstrates the need for improvements in training for all first responder organizations.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The FAPM will make improvements to first responder training for law enforcement, legal, chaplain, and medical personnel. There will be specific training on out-of-home abuse response. The training will include information about:

(a) How the program screens all employees working around children at Army sponsored activities, including coaches, school kitchen staff, bus drivers, Family Child Care home providers, and Chaplain program volunteers;

(b) How staff at these agencies must particularly watch for inappropriate touching;

(c) Protective supervision for programs with kids;

(d) Required reporting to the installation reporting point of contact and to DSW when there are concerns; and

(e) How/when Installation Strategy Teams form to assist with complex cases.

h. Fort Bragg School student/teacher refresher training and reporting procedures.

(1) Discussion.

(a) Fort Bragg Schools conduct annual "Good Touch, Bad Touch" training for both students and teachers. All teachers also participate in mandatory child abuse training. Refresher training would benefit both students and teachers.

(b) Department of Defense Education Activity (DoDEA) Regulation 2050.9, DoDEA Family Advocacy Program Process and Procedures for Reporting Incidents of Suspected Child Abuse and Neglect, provides guidance and establishes roles and responsibilities for working cooperatively with the FAP officials to protect and assist actual or alleged victims of child abuse and neglect. This regulation also establishes reporting requirements for all DoDEA employees associated with allegations or suspicions of child abuse occurring both within and outside of DoDEA schools.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken.

(a) Fort Bragg schools completed "Good Touch, Bad Touch" refresher training for both students and teachers. Each Department of Defense Education Activity employee completed mandatory "Child Abuse" training in August and September 2011. New employees complete the training when hired. The training requires teachers to notify both the Reporting Point of Contact and the DSW when there is alleged abuse by a staff member. Additionally, the school system will complete refresher training for all staff before the end of April to emphasize further the importance of adhering to the school's child abuse regulation, DODEA Reg. 2050.9. The Fort Bragg FAPM will conduct additional training in April involving all 12 Fort Bragg schools.

(b) The Director, DoDEA reemphasized reporting requirements found in DoDEA Regulation 2050.9 to all DoDEA Area Directors, Area Superintendents, District Superintendents and School Principals. The Director's 9 March 2012 memorandum reiterated DoDEA regulatory guidance directing that any DoDEA employee who has reason to believe that a student has been abused or neglected, either within or outside of DoDEA schools, shall report that information to the local installation's FAP officer immediately or the installation's designated reporting point (e.g. Military Police), no matter how they learn about the possible abuse or neglect. The information shall also be promptly reported to the reporting employee's immediate supervisor. The Director also directed that training for child abuse reporting procedures will be provided to all new administrators and discussed annually during school orientation week.

i. Issue. Conflicting time lines for submitting SIR and Commander's Critical Information Requirements (CCIR) reports.

(1) Discussion. A review of "SIR and Senior Commander (SC) Fort Bragg's CCIR Reporting Requirements," dated 20 September 2010, revealed three different timelines for submitting SIRs and CCIR relating to Category 2 (child abuse) incidents. Paragraph 2.B.2 states units will submit an electronic report to the FBOC within 20 hours of telephonic notification. Paragraph 2 to Enclosure 1 states units will submit an electronic report to the FBOC within 24 hours of telephonic notification. Paragraph 5 to Enclosure 1 states units will submit an electronic report to the FBOC within 48 hours of notification.

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The DPTMS, Plans and Operations Division is responsible for FBOC operations. The DPTMS, Chief of Operations will revise FBOC Watch Officer guidance to reflect Department of the Army guidance outlined in AR 190-40, Serious Incident Reporting. It establishes 24 hours as the timeline for submitting a written report.

j. Issue. Effectiveness of the Town Hall meetings.

(1) Discussion. The delay in properly addressing the abuse allegations required the Garrison Commander to conduct several Town Halls within the week after letters went to the parents of children in Fort Bragg schools. The Garrison Commander conducted three Town Hall meetings on 16 March 2012 at Pope and Holbrook Elementary schools and the Main Post Theater. The attitudes of those attending ranged from seeking information to outwardly upset. Ultimately, the Town Hall meetings met the intent to inform the Fort Bragg community. As every alleged abuse case is different, the Strategy Team should recommend to the Garrison Commander whether or not to conduct a Town Hall meeting in a particular case.

IMBG-PL

SUBJECT: Out-of Home Abuse After Actions Review

(2) Recommendation(s)/Corrective Action(s) Taken. The FAPM will include a requirement in MOI 1-10 that Strategy Teams consider conducting Town Hall meetings in the event of out-of-home abuse allegations.

6. The point of contact for this action is Mr. (b) (6) the Family Advocacy Program Manager.

(b) (6)

Deputy to the Garrison Commander